

**ANGER EXPRESSION IN *COMMENTS ON SENATOR FRASER*
ANNING POST IN FACEBOOK SOCIAL MEDIA**



**Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Getting Bachelor
Degree of Education in English Department**

By:

UNNA RIANTIKA SUWARNO

A320150104

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**

2020

APPROVAL

ANGER EXPRESSION IN *COMMENTS ON SENATOR FRASER*
ANNING POST IN FACEBOOK SOCIAL MEDIA

PUPBLICATION ARTICLE

by:

UNNA RIANTIKA SUWARNO

A320150104

Approved to be examined by Consultant :



(Dra. Siti Zuhriah Ariatmi, M.Hum)

NIK. 225

ACCEPTANCE

**ANGER EXPRESSION IN *COMMENTS ON SENATOR FRASER ANNING*
POST IN FACEBOOK SOCIAL MEDIA**

**BY
UNNA RIANTIKA SUWARNO
A320150104**

**Accepted and Approved by Based on Examiner
School of Teacher Training and Education
Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta
On Februari 25th, 2020**

Board of Examiner:

- 1. Dra. Siti Zuhriah Ariatmi, M. Hum
(Head of Examiner)**
- 2. Agus Wijayanto, Ph.D
(Member one of Examiner)**
- 3. Dr. Malikatul Laila, M.Hum
(Member two of Examiner)**

()
()
()

Dean,



Prof. Dr. Harun Joko Prayitno, M.Hum

NIDN. 0928046501

TESTIMONY

Herewith, I pronounce this research paper, there is no plagiarism of the previous study, which has been raised to obtain bachelor degree of university, or there are opinion or masterpiece, which have been written or published by others, except those in which the writing are referred in the manuscript and mentioned in the bibliography.

Later, if it is proven any some untrue statements in this testimony. I will fully responsibility.

Surakarta, February 25th 2020

The Researcher



UNNA RIANTIKA SUWARNO

A320150104

ANGER EXPRESSION IN COMMENTS ON SENATOR FRASER ANNING POST IN FACEBOOK SOCIAL MEDIA

Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan tindakan ilokusi pada ekspresi marah dalam komentar pada postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook, mengklasifikasikan implikatur dari ekspresi kemarahan dalam komentar pada postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook, dan mencari tahu maksim yang dilanggar dalam ekspresi marah yang tercermin dalam komentar di postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook. Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif dengan menggunakan metode deskriptif. Objek yang dianalisis adalah ekspresi marah yang muncul di komentar di postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook. Data penelitian ini berupa ucapan yang mengandung ekspresi marah yang ada di komentar yang diposting di media sosial Facebook pada tahun 2019. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode pengumpulan data berupa dokumentasi dan observasi. Analisis pada penelitian ini dilakukan dengan menggunakan analisis pragmatik. Berdasarkan hasil analisis, tindakan ilokusi yang paling dominan yang ditemukan dalam komentar pada postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook adalah representatif yang terdiri dari pernyataan yang muncul dalam 16 (44,4%) data, memberitahukan dalam 7 (19,4%) data, penolakan dalam 2 (5,6%) data, dan memprediksi atau menebak dalam 1 (2,8%) data. Berikutnya adalah tindakan ilokusi direktif yang terdiri dari memerintah dalam 1 (2,8%) data, dan mempertanyakan atau bertanya dalam 7 (19,4%) data. Tindakan ilokusi ekspresif yang dikategorikan sebagai menyatakan tidak suka atau tidak setuju muncul dalam 1 (2,8%) data. Yang terakhir adalah tindakan ilokusi commissive yang muncul dalam 1 (2,8%) data yang dikategorikan sebagai tantangan atau menantang. Implikasi paling dominan dari ekspresi marah yang ditemukan dalam komentar di postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook adalah implikatur generalized yang muncul dalam 18 data (50%). Sementara itu, implikatur particularized muncul dalam 10 data (27,8%). Implikatur konvensional adalah yang paling sedikit muncul dalam 8 data (22,2%). Maksim yang paling dominan yang dilanggar dalam komentar pada postingan Senator Fraser Anning di media sosial Facebook adalah maxim manner yang muncul dalam 15 data (41,7%). Kemudian diikuti oleh maxim quality yang muncul dalam 14 data (38,9%). Maksim yang paling sedikit dilanggar adalah maxim quantity yang muncul dalam 7 data (19,4%).

Kata kunci: ekspresi marah, tindakan ilokusi, implikatur, pelanggaran maxim

Abstract

This research was intended to describe the illocutionary act of anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media, classify the implicature of the anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media, and find out the maxim violated in the anger expressions reflected in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts

in Facebook social media. In this research, the researcher applies a descriptive qualitative research, which employed a descriptive method. The object to be analyzed is the anger expression used by the comments in the Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media. The data of the research are utterances containing anger expression used in the comments posted on Facebook social media in 2019. This research applied documentation and observation as the method of data collection. The analysis was done using pragmatics analysis. Based on the result of analysis, the most dominant illocutionary act occur in the comment on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is representative that consists of stating which appear in 16 (44,4%) data, notifying in 7 (19,4%) data, denying in 2 (5,6%) data, and predicting or guessing in 1 (2,8%) data. Next is directive illocutionary act that consists of commanding in 1 (2,8%) data, and questioning or asking in 7 (19,4%) data. Expressive illocutionary act which categorized as expressing dislike or disagreement appear in 1 (2,8%) data. The last is commissive illocutionary act that appear in 1 (2,8%) data categorized as betting or challenging. The most dominant implicature of the anger expression found in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is generalized implicature which appear in 18 data (50%). Meanwhile, particularized implicature appear in 10 data (27,8%). The least is conventional implicature which appear in 8 data (22,2%). the most dominant maxim that violated in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is the maxim of manner which appear in 15 data (41,7%). Then followed by the maxim of quality which appear in 14 data (38,9%). The least maxim violated is the maxim of quantity which appear in 7 data (19,4%).

Keywords: anger expression, illocutionary act, implicature, maxim violation

1. INTRODUCTION

Angry words or anger expression can be found in anywhere in the daily life of people, either spoken or written. Anger expression is something common to happen since it is an expression of unpleasant feeling that can be uttered by anyone. People can express their emotion such as anger feeling through social media, like Facebook. It offers over how updates are broadcast (i.e., users can configure any update to be broadcast to the public, to their friends, or to a subset of their friends). Facebook status updates may provide a more authentic source of self-expression Hollenbaugh, E. E. (2010). The practice consists of overlaying a question to an image or a video often a Facebook live video and encouraging the audience to respond by choosing between two Facebook reactions, the “Angry” reaction typically being one of the options.

In the context of social media, which tend to privilege emotional responses to issues and debates rather than reasoned discourse (Yardi and boyd, 2010), platforms' affordances such as Facebook Reactions facilitate the mobilization of anger as a tool of power (Ost, 2004). Recently added post on Facebook (<https://7news.com.au/politics/anning>, 2019) about Queensland senator Fraser Anning's has trigger a lot of political news comments, particularly which shows anger to the news post on senator Fraser Anning.

Over the last seven days Queensland senator Fraser Anning's Facebook page has grown in followers by a greater percentage (22%) than any of the major political parties, according to data from analytics tool Crowdtangle 2019. The page and all its posts appeared to have been removed after one of Senator Anning's posts was reported for hate speech. The comments in question, which were reported anonymously, were in reference to a speech he made in Parliament on the national Safe Schools program.

One person, Adam Kennedy who reported the posts told the ABC they were similar to tweets the Senator has made where he calls Safe Schools a "degenerate program" for "commo perverts". Senator Anning described the move by Facebook to unpublish his page as an attack on free speech. Moreover, there were many anger speech can be found in the Fraser Anning's Facebook post.

Anger expression is expressed when people feels angry, irritated and annoyed toward other people, or situations which they do not like. In verbal action, the speaker says it by using high or low tone, harsh voice, word pressure and rude words in direct and indirect ways. Sometimes people yell and raise their voice to show anger (Atkinson et al. 1983: 333).

In verbal action, the anger expressions are also showed by using utterances. The kinds of utterances which are said in anger expressions are different like hate, annoy, angry. The ways to deliver the utterances which show anger are different as well. It can be delivered by using question form and imperative form. The intentions in saying the utterances which express anger are also different because it is influenced by the situation which makes the speaker

angry. The intentions are such as commanding, refusing, questioning, etc. This study of intention belongs to a pragmatics study.

According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). In pragmatics, the study is about the meaning of the context between the speaker and the listener. From the explanation above, it means pragmatics is the study of speaker's meaning. Pragmatics is the study of speaker's meaning. With pragmatics, people can talk people's intended meanings, their assumption, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of action that they are performing when they speaks (Yule, 1996:4).

This approach also necessarily involves how listener can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. Those kinds of actions performed through utterance above are known as speech act. As Austin (1962:94) states that speech acts is a theory in which to say something is to do something. Speech act theory explain how speakers use language to accomplish intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning form what is said. Speech act is the people expression of something by utterance.

To achieve their goals, speakers are not only saying something but also there is an action embedded in their utterances. An utterance which performs an action is called a speech act. A speech act is an action through which people do something by using their language. Every utterance spoken by people in real life consists of speech act which has functions such as to command, to warn, or to express the speaker's purposes.

The function of word, the specific purpose that the speakers have in mind is known as illocutionary act. It is also the purpose or contextual meaning of utterance. Illocutionary act (an act in saying something) which sets a function to perform the intended meaning in utterances. Illocutionary act has some different types. Searle (1975) in Levinson (1983:240) proposed that there are five classification of illocutionary act; they are representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Illocutionary acts is used to analyze any utterances who produced by the listener and the speaker.

Each type of illocutionary acts above has a different context and meaning. First representative, that the speaker believes something being the case or not. Second is directive when the speaker requesting to the listener, listener perform an action. Third, commissive, asks the speaker to do something in the future. The fourth is expressive; it shows an expression how the speaker feels about the situation. The last is declarative, it changes world by the utterance which is produced.

Illocutionary act is interesting to be analyzed in order to understand the function of utterances and the intended meaning of utterances. It includes context of situation in analyzing illocutionary act because context of situation can bring some information to understand the intended meaning of utterance. There are some researches that have conducted research on pragmatics study of illocutionary act. Indrianingsih (2017) identified the pragmalinguistics forms of anger expressions and to explain the intentions of expressing anger by the characters in the crime movies. The pragmalinguistics forms of anger expressions are analyzed by using Madow's theory. Madow (in Ladd 1996:637- 639) described anger forms into three types that are 1) direct forms such as verbal cruelty, critical, fault finding, name calling, accusing someone, hatred, insults, disgust, revengeful, less intense but clear; 2) thinly veiled forms such as distrustful, skeptical, argumentative, irritable, indirectly challenging, given to sarcasm, cynical humor; 3) indirect forms such as silence, little communication, depression, distracting activity, and crying.

Considering the variety of expressions of anger and various factors influencing the emergence of angry expressions, this research has purpose to describe the illocutionary act of anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media, The research applied theory illocutionary act by Yule (1996), classify the theory implicature of the anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning *posts* in Facebook social media by Grice (1975) (in Levinson, 1983). and find out the maxim violated in the anger expressions reflected in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning *posts* in Facebook social media Grice (1975) (in Cruse 2000)..

2. METHOD

This research applied descriptive qualitative method since the data in this research is in the form of words and sentences. The findings of this research is also presented in the form of description which consist of three main points, the illocutionary act of anger expression in follower's comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media along with the implicatures that arise from the anger expressions spoken by those followers' comments, and the maxim which are violated in the anger expression of the follower's comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media.

The object to be analyzed is the anger expression used by the comments in the Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media. The data of the research are utterances containing anger expression used in the comments in the Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media.

The data are the comment in the news of Senator Anning Fraser posted on Facebook social media in 2019. To provide the sufficient data for the research, the most commented news is chosen based on the news posted and most phenomenal one.

This research applied documentation and observation as the method of data collection. Here, the researcher collected the data which are the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media.

In analyzing the data, the researcher applies pragmatics analysis. Based on the content analysis, all the data which are collected is analyzed based on the following steps: To describe the intention or the illocutionary act of the anger expression found in the comments of Senator Fraser Anning using the theory proposed by Yule (1996). To determine the implicatures of the anger expressions found in the comments of Senator Fraser Anning by using the implicatures theory of Grice (1975) (in Levinson, 1983). To find out the maxim violated in the comment of Senator Fraser Anning by using the theory of cooperative principle by Grice (1975) (in Cruse 2000). To draw conclusion from data analysis and giving suggestions.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the problem statement of the research, the findings is divided into three parts, they are the illocutionary act of anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media, the implicature of the anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media, and the maxim violated in the anger expressions reflected in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media. The findings are as follow:

3.1 Illocutionary Act

The first finding is the illocutionary act of anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media. There are several types of illocutionary acts. In other sources, those types of illocutionary act are also said as the types of speech act. Based on Searle as cited in George Yule (1996), there are five types of illocutionary act, they are representatives, directives, commissive, and expressive.

The summary on the findings of the illocutionary act of anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Findings on Illocutionary Act

No	Illocutionary Act	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Representative	26	
	Stating	16	44,4
	Notifying	7	19,4
	Denying	2	5,6
	Guessing or predicting	1	2,8
2	Directives	8	
	Commanding	1	2,8
	Questioning or asking	7	19,4
3	Commissive	1	
	Betting or challenging	1	2,8
4	Expressive	1	
	Dislike or disagreement	1	2,8
	Total	36	100%

Based on the findings, it was found that the most dominant illocutionary act occur in the comment on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is representative that consists of stating which appear in 16 (44,4%) data, notifying in 7 (19,4%) data, denying in 2 (5,6%) data, and predicting or guessing in 1 (2,8%) data. Next is directive illocutionary act that consists of commanding in 1 (2,8%) data, and questioning or asking in 7 (19,4%) data. Expressive illocutionary act which categorized as expressing dislike or disagreement appear in 1 (2,8%) data. The last is commissive illocutionary act that appear in 1 (2,8%) data categorized as betting or challenging. Declarative illocutionary act was not found in the data since in directive illocutionary act, the speaker has to have special institutional role in a specific context, such as sentencing law or declaring formal statement, meanwhile, comments do not consists constitutes to sentence or words that related to institutional context but rather in the form of an opinion or statements.

Technically, the illocutionary is the term introduced by John L. Austin in inspecting some cases concern to what he calls with 'performative' and 'constative utterances'. According to his original exposition in "How to Do Things With Words", the function of an illocutionary act is an act (1) for the performance of which I must make it clear to some other person that the act is performed (Austin speaks of the 'securing of uptake'), and (2) the performance of which involves the production of what Austin calls 'conventional consequences' as, e.g., rights, commitments, or obligations. For instead, in order to successfully perform a promise I must make clear to my audience that the promise occurs, and undertake an obligation to do the promised thing: hencing the promise is an illocutionary act in the present sense. In other word, for certain reasons, among them insufficient knowledge of Austin's original exposition in term of illocutionary act is nowadays understood in a number of other ways. Many clinicians define the term of Austin with reference to examples, saying such things as that any speech act like stating, asking, commanding, promising, and so on is an illocutionary act; they then often fail to give any sense of the expression illocutionary act capable of making clear what being an illocutionary act essentially consists in.

3.2 Implicature

Second is the finding on the implicature of the anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media.

The summary on the findings of the implicature of anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media can be seen in the following table 2.

Table 2. Findings on Implicature

No	Implicature	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Conventional	8	22,2
2	Particularized conversational	10	27,8
3	Generalized conversational	18	50
	Total	36	100

Based on the above table, it was found that the most dominant implicature of the anger expression found in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is generalized implicature which appear in 18 data (50%). Meanwhile, particularized implicature appear in 10 data (27,8%). The least is conventional implicature which appear in 8 data (22,2%).

3.3 Maxim Violation

Third is the finding on the maxim violated in the anger expressions reflected in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media.

The summary on the findings of the maxim violated in the anger expressions in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media can be seen in the following table.

Table 3. Findings on the Maxim Violated

No	Maxim	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Quantity	7	19,4
2	Quality	14	38,9
3	Manner	15	41,7
	Total	36	100

It was found that the most dominant maxim that violated in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is the maxim of manner

which appear in 15 data (41,7%). Then followed by the maxim of quality which appear in 14 data (38,9%). The least maxim violated is the maxim of quantity which appear in 7 data (19,4%).

Basically, people are not always truthful and cooperative in a conversation. Each conversation may contain the reasons of the speakers. These reasons can be good or bad for the speakers and the listeners. In this case, it is regarded as violating the maxims, when the participants are being uncooperative in doing the conversation. Zor (2006) argues that people tend to violate the maxims during the exchange of conversation quietly and unostentatiously when they fail to observe the maxims intentionally.

In the linguistics field, even more specifically in the area of pragmatics, an important concept was introduced: maxims of conversation. It is unwritten rules that govern people to make an appropriate conversation. The Cooperative Principle (CP) was first formulated by Herbert Paul Grice (1975) which refers to the assumption of a basic conversation which is made when the speaker speaks to one another that is trying to be cooperative when doing a conversation in order to construct meaningful conversations. It is explained by Terkourafi (2005: 1) that Grice's Theory of Cooperative Principle was proposed to depict how effective communication is achieved in common situations. An effective conversation can happen when the speakers and the listeners can understand each other in a conversation. They can share what they intend to share smoothly. Then, they can accept each other's meaning despite the status, whether they are close friends, parents, teachers, sellers and buyers, etc. The speakers behave in a particular way to lead the listeners to understand the speakers' utterances so that the listeners are able to give the appropriate response to the speakers' utterances. The concept of cooperative activity leads the listeners to assume that all speakers are always cooperative.

This cooperative principle is an umbrella term for nine components that guide how people communicate. These nine components are grouped together into four categories, called the Maxims of Conversation: the maxim of quality (truthfulness), the maxim of quantity (informativeness), the maxim of relation

(relevance), and the maxim of manner (perspicuity).

Here, Grice (1975: 45) proposes some rules that should be obeyed in doing a conversation. These rules are formulated in a principle of cooperating called Cooperative Principle (CP). CP has four sub-principles called maxims; Maxim of Quantity, Quality, Manner, and Relevance. According to Bach (2006: 5) those maxims are used to explain the relation between utterances and what is understood from them. Bach (2006: 6) also claims that the participants as a listener assume that a speaker is being cooperative by speaking truthfully, informatively, relevantly, and appropriately.

4. CONCLUSION

There are some conclusion that can be derived based on the results of this research, they are as follow.

The most dominant illocutionary act occur in the comment on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is representative that consists of stating which appear in 16 (44,4%) data, notifying in 7 (19,4%) data, denying in 2 (5,6%) data, and predicting or guessing in 1 (2,8%) data. Next is directive illocutionary act that consists of commanding in 1 (2,8%) data, and questioning or asking in 7 (19,4%) data. Expressive illocutionary act which categorized as expressing dislike or disagreement appear in 1 (2,8%) data. The last is commissive illocutionary act that appear in 1 (2,8%) data categorized as betting or challenging.

The most dominant implicature of the anger expression found in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is generalized implicature which appear in 18 data (50%). Meanwhile, particularized implicature appear in 10 data (27,8%). The least is conventional implicature which appear in 8 data (22,2%).

The most dominant maxim that violated in the comments on Senator Fraser Anning posts in Facebook social media is the maxim of manner which appear in 15 data (41,7%). Then followed by the maxim of quality which appear in 14 data (38,9%). The least maxim violated is the maxim of quantity which

appear in 7 data (19,4%).

Based on the above findings of the research, it can be seen that declarative illocutionary act was not found in the data since in directive illocutionary act, the speaker has to have special institutional role in a specific context, such as sentencing law or declaring formal statement, meanwhile, comments do not consists constitutes to sentence or words that related to institutional context but rather in the form of an opinion or statements. In addition, anger is typically expressed only through loud verbalizations, it is the cases of aggression that wind up in the criminal justice system. Therefore, declarative illocutionary act may not appear in the anger expression.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crystal, David. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*: 6th Edition.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman Group Ltd
- Hughes, Geoffrey. 1939. *An Encyclopedia of Swearing*. New York: Armonk
- Hunaifi, Abdul Aziz. (2011). *Ungkapan Emosi dalam Novel The Old Man and The Sea dan Escape*. Yogyakarta: UGM. Unpublished Thesis.
- Jakobson, R. (1993). *On Linguistic Aspect of translation*. In Schulte, R., & Biguenet, J. (eds). *Theories of Translation : An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti. (1984). *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta : Gramedia.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Ljung, Magnus. (2011). *Swearing: A Cross-Cultural Linguistic Study*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mastuti. (2003). *Penelitian Emotions and States of Mind dalam Dongeng Jawa*. Depok: Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya UI.
- Nadar, F.X. (2009). *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Podungge, Rusni. (2009). *A Dream Deferred of American Education: a Semiotic Study on Hansberry's A Raisin in the Sun*. Yogyakarta: UGM. Unpublished Thesis

- Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo. (2005). *Ellipsis in Indonesia and Javanese*. Journal of Language and Literature, Vol. 3, No. 3 USD Yogyakarta
- Quirk dan Greenbaum. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. Hongkong: Commonwealth Printing Ltd. Press
- Rahardi, Kunjana. (2009). *Sosiopragmatik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
- Schieman, S. (1999). *Age and Anger*. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 40 (September); 273-289.
- Schiraldi, Glenn. (2001). R and Melissa Hallmark Kerr. *The Anger Management Sourcebook*. New York: The Mc Graw Hill Company.